

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-32 are pending in the present application; Claim 23 is amended; and Claim 32 is added. Support for the amendment to Claim 23 is found, for example, in Fig. 19. Support for new Claim 32 is found, for example, in Fig. 26. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 23 and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as anticipated by Chauvel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,369,855, hereinafter Chauvel) in view of Okada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,870, hereinafter Okada); and Claims 25, 27 and 29-31 were allowed.

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for allowance of Claims 25, 27, and 29-31.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 23 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Chauvel in view of Okada, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to Claim 23 overcomes this ground of rejection. Amended Claim 23 recites, *inter alia*, “a control unit configured to generate a time relation table in order to record information of the generated time relation table in said medium.”

Chauvel does not teach or suggest “a control unit configured to generate a time relation table in order to record information of the generated time relation table in said medium.”

Okada does not cure the deficiency in Chauvel. Okada only discloses a time map table, which is different than the claimed “time relation table.” As described in the specification for a non-limiting embodiment of the claimed invention, the time relation table

indicates the relationship between the time stamps (ATS) and the PTS values.<sup>1</sup> Okada discloses that the time map table only shows the size of each VOBU and the reproduction period of each VOBU. Thus, Okada does not describe or suggest the claimed “a control unit configured to generate a time relation table in order to record information of the generated time relation table in said medium.”


Moreover, the distinction between time map information and the claimed “time relation table” is further expressed by new Claim 32, which further patentably distinguishes over Okada and Chauvel.

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 23 (and dependent Claims 23 and 32) patentably distinguish over Chauvel and Okada, taken alone or in proper combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Scott A. McKeown  
Registration No. 42,866

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

---

<sup>1</sup> Specification, page 5, lines 4-11.